

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-11 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

The specification has been amended to better conform to the requirements of U.S. practice. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

In the Office Action, the Abstract of the Disclosure was objected to because of informalities. The Abstract has been amended to correct the informalities.

Turning now to the art rejections, claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugimoto (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0015986) in view of Onagawa (U.S. Patent No. 6,804,259). Applicants submit that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of the references.

As amended herein, claim 1 recites:

means for descrambling plural packets from the reconstructed one transport stream using a conditional access module and for separating the necessary packets; and

...

wherein the conditional access module has information needed to descramble the packets from the plurality of transport streams that are in the reconstructed one transport stream.

(Emphasis added.) Neither the relied on sections Sugimoto nor the relied on sections of Onagawa disclose or suggest descrambling plural packets from a reconstructed transport stream using a conditional access module, and neither the relied on sections Sugimoto nor the relied on sections of Onagawa disclose or suggest a conditional access module that has information needed to descramble packets from a plurality of transport streams that are in a reconstructed transport stream.

It follows, for at least these reasons, that neither the relied on sections of Sugimoto nor the relied on sections of Onagawa, whether taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the combination out in claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore patentably distinct and unobvious over the relied on references.

Independent claims 4, 6, 7, and 10 each been amended to recite features similar to those set out in the above excerpts of claim 1. Claims 4, 6, 7, and 10 are therefore each patentably distinct and unobvious over the relied on sections Sugimoto and Onagawa at least the same reasons.

Claims 2-3 from claim 1, claim 5 from claim 4, claims 8-9 from claim 7, and claim 11 depends from claim 10. Therefore, each of these claims is distinguishable over the relied on art for at least the same reasons as the claim from which it depends.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the Examiner's objections and the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.


Application No.: 10/509,357

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.3-358

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: August 22, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Lawrence E. Russ

Registration No.: 35,342

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

911491_1.DOC